

PATENT

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are pending in the present application. In the above amendments, claims 1, 4, 6 and 8-13 have been amended, and claims 2-3, 5, and 7 have been canceled. Applicant respectfully responds to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-13 were rejected as being allegedly unpatentable over Komaili (US 6,529,730 B1) in view of Lee (US 2002/0071396) and Uhlik (US 2002/0065063 A1). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, singly or in combination, do not disclose the claimed limitations. Specifically, none of the references discloses “*wherein said software modules are selected from the group comprising of a first multi-media module, a second multi-media module, a first cipher algorithm, a second cipher algorithm, a first audio front-end module, a second front-end module, a first DSP interface, a second DSP interface, a first secure communication module, a second secure communication module, a first synchronous communication module, a second synchronous communication module, a first asynchronous communication module, a second asynchronous communication module a voice communication module, and a data communication module,*” as now claimed in all independent claims. In contrast, Komaili discloses only the “vocoder 206, 208, and 210” (Col. 6, line 5; Col. 7, line 25) and Lee discloses only “a plurality of vocoders 110” (page 3, para [0050], line 4).

Applicant also respectfully submits that the cited references, singly or in combination, do not disclose either “*receiving a command to set up a communication, said command comprising information relating to the type of communication desired*” or “*selecting at least one of said plurality of software modules based on the type of communication desired.*” In contrast, Komaili discloses selecting a vocoder rate based on the level of speech activity (Col. 8, lines 6-9), and Lee discloses “the called party’s network is notified that the calling party is calling from a particular type of network (page 2, para. [0023]) and “vocoder may be selected based on the calling party’s network type” (Page 3, para. [0052]). The cited references singly or in combination do not disclose or suggest selecting a software module based on a “desired communication type.”

PATENT

Selecting a vocoder based speech activity or the network type, as disclosed by the cited references, is different from selecting a software module based on the communication type, e.g., secure/non-secure communication, data/voice, synchronous/asynchronous, as now claimed in all independent claims.

Therefore, since the cited references, singly or in combination, do not disclose at least the above claimed limitations, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection.

PATENT

REQUEST FOR ALLOWANCE

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that all pending claims in the application are patentable. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 8, 2005

By: 
Abdollah Katbab, Reg. No. 45,325
(858) 651-4132

QUALCOMM Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502

Attorney Docket No.: 020145
Customer No.: 23696